R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 558 AC 001 728

INITIATION OF STRUCTURE, CONSIDERATION, AND TASK PERFORMANCE IN INTERCULTURAL DISCUSSION GROUPS.

BY- ANDERSON, LYNN R.
ILLINOIS UNIV., URBANA, GROUP EFFECTIVE. RES. LAB.

REPORT NUMBER TR-30 PUB DATE APR 66
REPORT NUMBER ARPA-454
REPORT NUMBER NR-177-472-NONR-1834-36
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.32 31P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DISCUSSION GROUPS, *LEADERSHIP STYLES, *BEHAVIOR RATING SCALES, *CULTURAL DIFFERENCES, *INTERCULTURAL PROGRAMS, GROUP STRUCTURE, GROUP BEHAVIOR, SELF EVALUATION, TASK PERFORMANCE, PROGRAMS, GRADUATE STUDENTS, ROLE PERCEPTION, BEHAVIOR STANDARDS, ANGLO AMERICANS, HETEROGENEOUS GROUPING, INDIANS,

. RATINGS OF THE LEADER'S INITIATION OF STRUCTURE AND CONSIDERATION WERE OBTAINED FROM 36 INTERCULTURAL DISCUSSION GROUPS OF ONE AMERICAN AND ONE INDIAN GRADUATE STUDENT PLUS AN AMERICAN LEADER. RATINGS OF GROUP ATMOSPHERE, ESTEEM FOR LEADER, AND LEADER EFFECTIVENESS WERE ALSO OBTAINED AFTER EACH GROUP COMPLETED AN INTERCULTURAL NEGOTIATION TASK AND A GROUP CREATIVITY TASK. RESULTS SHOWED THAT AMERICAN AND INDIAN MEMBERS' ESTEEM FOR LEADER AND GROUP ATMOSPHERE RATINGS WERE POSITIVELY CORRELATED WITH THE LEADER'S CONSIDERATE BEHAVIOR BUT NOT WITH HIS STRUCTURING BEHAVIOR. EFFECTIVENESS AS RATED BY AMERICANS WAS POSITIVELY CORRELATED WITH CONSIDERATION AND INITIATION OF STRUCTURE. WHEN RATED BY THE INDIANS, EFFECTIVENESS WAS CORRELATED ONLY WITH CONSIDERATION. THE LEADER'S SELF RATINGS OF CONSIDERATION AND INITIATION OF STRUCTURE WERE POSITIVELY CORRELATED WITH HIS RATINGS OF GROUP ATMOSPHERE AND OF HIS EFFECTIVENESS. GROUP PERFORMANCE WAS UNRELATED TO CONSIDERATION RATINGS BUT WAS POSITIVELY RELATED TO INITIATION OF STRUCTURE, THIS FINDING BEING SPECIFIC TO THE CULTURE AND THE TASK. (AUTHOR/AJ)

ED019558

Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY · UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS · URBANA, ILL.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INITIATION OF STRUCTURE, CONSIDERATION, AND TASK PERFORMANCE IN INTERCULTURAL DISCUSSION GROUPS

LYNN R. ANDERSON
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 30
APRIL, 1966

Communication, Cooperation, and Negotiation in Culturally Heterogeneous Groups
Contract NR 177-472, Nonr 1834(36) with the Advanced Research Projects Agency, ARPA Order No. 454

FRED E. FIEDLER, LAWRENCE M. STOLUROW, AND HARRY C. TRIANDIS
Principal Investigators

HC001 728

GROUP EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH LABORATORY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

URBANA, ILLINOIS

Initiation of Structure, Consideration, and Task Performance in Intercultural Discussion Groups

Lynn R. Anderson

Wayne State University

Technical Report No. 30

April, 1966

Communication, Cooperation, and Negotiation
in Culturally Heterogeneous Groups

Supported by the

Advanced Research Projects Agency
ARPA Order No. 454, Contract NR 177-472, Nonr 1834(36)

Fred E. Fiedler, Lawrence M. Stolurow, and Harry C. Triandis
Principal Investigators

A B S T R A C T

Initiation of Structure, Consideration, and Task Performance in Intercultural Discussion Groups

Lynn R. Anderson

Wayne State University*

Ratings of the leader's Initiation of Structure and Consideration were obtained from members of 36 intercultural discussion groups consisting of one American and one Indian graduate student plus an American leader. Ratings of Group Atmosphere, Esteem for Leader, and Effectiveness of Leader were also obtained after each group had completed an intercultural negotiation task and also after completing a group creativity task. Results showed that on both tasks the American and Indian members' Esteem for Leader and Group Atmosphere ratings were positively correlated with the leader's considerate behavior but were not related to the leader's structuring behavior. The leader's Effectiveness as rated by Americans was positively correlated with both Consideration and Initiation of Structure scores. When rated by the Indian subjects, the leader's Effectiveness was correlated only with his Consideration score. The leader's self ratings of Consideration and Initiation of Structure both were positively correlated with his own rating of the Group Atmosphere and with his rating of his own Effectiveness. The group performance scores were unrelated to Consideration ratings. However, group performance was positively related to the Initiation of Structure ratings, but this finding was specific to the culture and the task. The results were discussed in terms of differences in "role expectations" between the two cultural groups.

*This study was performed while the author was a member of the Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory of the University of Illinois.

Initiation of Structure, Consideration, and Task Performance in Intercultural Discussion Groups[1]

Lynn R. Anderson

Wayne State University

Introduction

In recent leadership research the factors of Consideration and Initiation of Structure appear to account for a substantial percentage of variations in leader behavior and leader styles. Consideration describes those leader behaviors which are oriented toward maintaining harmonious interpersonal relations and instigating warmth, respect and mutual trust in the leader-member relations. Behaviors identified as Initiation of Structure are attempts of the leader to establish well-defined channels of communication, patterns of organization and other means of getting the job done. The present research explores the relationship of these two dimensions of leader behavior as they are related to various leader and member attitudes and to the task performance of intercultural discussion groups.

The factors were initially identified by Halpin and Winer (1952) in a factor analysis of a 130-item Leader Behavior Questionnaire developed by Hemphill (1949). The two factors were relatively independent of each other and together accounted for approximately 83 percent of the variance when 300 aircraft crew members described their commanders on Hemphill's questionnaire.

---

[1]This research was supported by ARPA Order No. 454, Contract NR 177-472, Nonr 1834(36), "Communication, Cooperation, and Negotiation in Culturally Heterogeneous Groups," between the Advanced Research Projects Agency and the University of Illinois (Fred E. Fiedler, Lawrence M. Stolurow, and Harry C. Triandis, Principal Investigators). This report will appear as an article in the J. soc. Psychol., 1967 (In Press).

These same factors have also been identified in factor analyses of ratings of industrial foremen (Fleishman, 1953), state police supervisors (Bass, 1963), and ROTC students (Meuwese, 1964). Stodgill, Scott, and Jaynes (1957) report a further factor analytic study of data obtained from Naval officers and suggest that their factors of Administrative Control and Interpersonal Relations seem to correspond to the Initiation of Structure and Consideration factors, respectively. Kahn and Katz (1960) have identified "employee-centered" leader behavior and "production-centered" behavior which again seem somewhat parallel to Consideration and Initiation of Structure. Additional factor studies by Wherry (1950), Rupe (1951), and Roach (1956), have identified categories of leader behaviors which, according to Bass (1960) can safely be equated to Consideration and Initiation of Structure. More recently, Anderson (1964) found that "psychologically distant" leaders tended to initiate more structure while "psychologically close" leaders behaved in a more considerate manner - confirming predictions by Halpin (1954) and Fiedler (1962). And finally, Newport (1962) states that the Consideration and Initiation of Structure dimensions are probably similar to, although not synonymous with, the more traditional notions of democratic and autocratic styles of leader behavior. From this diverse collection of research evidence, it would appear that the isolation of these factors of Consideration and Initiation of Structure has approximated the identification of a rather primary set of leader behaviors.

Consideration and Initiation of Structure ratings generally have shown reliable relationships with leadership effectiveness ratings. The relationships are quite crucially dependent, however, upon the source of the effectiveness ratings, i.e., whether the leader is being evaluated by his superiors, or his subordinates. Subordinates generally rate the leader as being more effective to the extent that he displays considerate behavior.

When rated by his superiors, however, the effectiveness of this same leader is positively correlated with the structuring behavior which he is seen as instigating in his group (Halpin, 1954; Fleishman, Harris and Burtt, 1955).[2] The role conflict induced by these opposing role expectations has been referred to by Halpin (1954) as the "dilemma of leadership". The problem has been discussed more extensively by Bass (1960) and Shartle (1956).

Additional research also has shown that Consideration and Initiation of Structure are significantly related to members' "satisfaction" or liking for their group. Halpin (1954) found a positive correlation between aircraft crew's "Satisfaction Index" and the crew commander's considerate behavior, while the Satisfaction Index was negatively correlated with the commander's structuring behavior. Fleishman and Harris (1962) examined employee "grievances" and "turnover rate" in relationship to subordinates' ratings of their foreman's considerate and structuring behavior. Their study showed that both turnover rate and employee grievances were positively correlated with the amount of structure which the foreman instigated, but both indexes were, in turn, negatively correlated with the amount of considerate behavior attributed to the foreman. However, foremen who were rated low on both Consideration and Initiation of Structure had maximum turnover and employee grievance rates. Fleishman (1955) and Fleishman, et al., (1955) report further evidence that workers prefer groups with highly considerate foremen. Data from Bass (1963) and Meuwese (1964) corroborate this general finding. Although member satisfaction is quite strongly related to Consideration in these studies, Foa (1957) and Berkowitz (1953) caution that satisfaction is probably more crucially determined by member expectations of supervisor or leader behavior.

---

[2] Noteworthy exceptions to this latter conclusion can be found in Fleishman and Peters (1962) and Lawrie (1963). Both studies report non-significant correlations of Initiation of Structure and effectiveness ratings.

Although the factors of Consideration and Initiation of Structure appear to be quite consistently related to various efficiency ratings and satisfaction indexes, the relation to objective measures of group productivity has proved somewhat more elusive. However, after reviewing the available evidence, Shartle (1956) concludes that leader behavior which is high on both Consideration and Initiation of Structuring is most likely to bolster group performance. Some evidence supporting this notion is presented by Halpin (1954) and Fleishman and Harris (1962).

As part of a large laboratory study of intercultural discussion groups, the author collected Consideration and Initiation of Structure descriptions of leader behavior from the group members and also from the leader himself. The present report examines the relationship of these consideration and structure ratings to various efficiency, esteem, and satisfaction scores which were also collected from each group. Performance scores were also available on two different discussion tasks, an intercultural negotiation problem and a group creativity problem. In addition to replicating the previously mentioned studies, the data provide separate analyses for each of the two cultural groups (Indian and American) who participated in the experiment. From these analyses we can obtain some evidence for the cross-cultural generality of the Consideration and Initiation of Structure factors and their relationship to attitudes and productivity in culturally heterogeneous groups.

Method[3]

Subjects

The subjects for the experiment were volunteer male graduate students who were paid five dollars for approximately five hours of participation in an "International Discussion Research Project". Thirty-six American students were appointed formal leaders of three-man discussion groups, consisting of the leader, one other American student and one student who was a native of India.

Tasks

Each of the 36 groups was assigned to a separate room in a vacant men's dormitory where they were given two discussion tasks. The first task (Caste Problem) was an intercultural negotiation problem designed to elicit cultural differences between the American and the Indian group members. The Caste Problem dealt with difficulties encountered when an American industrial plant in India attempted to staff its positions on the basis of aptitude testing rather than by following the traditional caste hierarchy in the local village. Specific role assignments were made on this task with the Indian member assigned to represent an official from the Indian government and the American member assigned to be an American industrial expert. The leader was told he should participate in the discussion, but should act as a neutral moderator and not take sides with either the American or Indian member. The group was to write an employee selection policy which would be acceptable to the residents of the village and which would also be efficient in staffing the American industrial plant.

---

[3]The entire design of the original laboratory experiment is described in detail by Anderson (1964). Only those aspects relevant to the present paper are given in the following section.

The task was scored by having seven American judges rate on a 15-point scale how acceptable the policy would be to a large industrial plant. Similarly, five Indian judges rated on a 15-point scale how acceptable each group's policy would be to residents of an Indian village. The projected intercorrelation of the American judges was .75 and .57 for the Indian judges. The final productivity score on this task is the mean of the American and Indian evaluations of the policy.

The second task given to the groups was to write two original stories based on a TAT card. This task has been used in previous studies of group creativity (Fiedler, 1962; Anderson and Fiedler, 1964) and was included in the present study to give some continuity with this series and also to provide a contrast to the highly structured and culturally "biased" Caste problem. Each TAT story was rated from one to five points by seven judges using a seven category manual (Fiedler, 1962). The final criterion score was a sum of the ratings given to the two stories. The average intercorrelation of the seven judges was .95.

Post-session Measures

After the completion of each of the tasks each subject was given an individual test booklet which included the following questionnaires:

(a) A Leader Behavior Questionnaire which contained ten items describing the leader's behavior on the Consideration dimension and ten items describing the leader's Initiation of Structure behavior. The two group members described their leader on each of the 20 items by checking an eight-step scale after each of the items. The leader described himself on the same 20 items. The final Consideration and Initiation of Structure scores are a sum of the rating on the ten Consideration items and the ten Initiation of Structure items. The ten Consideration items were:

1) He did everything possible to make it pleasant for the members to be in the group.
2) He did not use large and difficult words, but spoke clearly.
3) He made especially sure the feelings of the members were not hurt.
4) He explained and gave reasons for the decisions which he wished to make.
5) He did not write down group solutions without first consulting the other group members.
6) He welcomed new ideas, even those with which he did not agree.
7) He treated the group members as his equals.
8) He was open to suggestions about changes in procedure.
9) He was friendly and easy to talk to.
10) He made members feel at ease when they were talking to him.

The ten Initiation of Structure items were:

1) He insisted that group members concentrate their efforts on turning out the best possible group solution.
2) He made sure the group members knew that he was in charge.
3) He formulated his own opinions and made them available to the group at an early stage.
4) He ruled with an "iron hand" so that the group discussion did not get out of control.
5) He made a definite plan of procedure and insisted that group members followed it.
6) He let the group members know what was expected of them.
7) He assigned group members to specific tasks if this seemed feasible.
8) He complimented good work and criticized poor work.

9) He watched the time and tried to meet deadlines.

10) He spoke in a decisive manner.

These 20 items are rewordings of items which were found by Halpin and Winer (1952) to be highly related to the Structure and Consideration factors. Since the Halpin and Winer article provides the loading of each of the 20 items on the factors of Consideration and Initiation of Structure, a coefficient of congruence (Tucker, 1951) could be computed between these original factors and the first two factors obtained from a factor analysis of the Leader Behavior Questionnaire used in the present study.[4] These coefficients ranged from .86 to .96 and, although significant tests are not available for this statistic, it did appear that the coefficients were sufficiently high to justify the assumption that the factors had replicated the original factors identified by Halpin and Winer as Consideration and Initiation of Structure. The two factors accounted for approximately 50% of the variance in the Leader Behavior Questionnaire.

(b) A Group Atmosphere questionnaire which asked each subject to evaluate the atmosphere of his group on a series of 10 evaluative adjective scales of the semantic differential form (Osgood, et al., 1957). A high score (eight) was always assigned to the favorable end of each scale, thus a high Group Atmosphere score indicates that the subject felt the group interaction was pleasant or enjoyable. This questionnaire has been used previously in studies of group creativity (Fiedler, 1962) as a measure of the "stress" or "interpersonal tensions" which are produced during a group's interaction. The Group Atmosphere score may also be seen as a tentative index of group "morale".

---

[4] Interpretation of the coefficient is somewhat similar to a correlation coefficient since the range is from +1.00 for perfect factorial agreement to -1.00 for perfect negative agreement and zero for no agreement of the factors.

(c) An Esteem for Leader questionnaire which asked the members to rate their leader on the same semantic differential scales used in ratings of the Group Atmosphere. Obtained in this manner, the Esteem score corresponds to Fishbein's recent definition of "attitude" as the "affective evaluation of an object" (Fishbein and Raven, 1962; Anderson and Fishbein, 1965). A high esteem score indicates a favorable attitude or general acceptance of the leader.

(d) A Post-meeting questionnaire containing seven items rating the group task, and various aspects of the discussion project. One item from this questionnaire (How well did the chairman do his job?) seemed to correspond to an "effectiveness" rating of the leader and will be referred to as such in the remainder of the report.

Results

Members' Ratings of Leader Behavior

As in many of the previously mentioned studies which examined the factors of Consideration and Initiation of Structure, the group members' ratings of the leader's behavior were summed (Indian plus American) and then correlated with the various attitude scores. These results are presented in Table 1. Here it can be seen that on both of the group tasks, the leader's considerate behavior was highly correlated with the members' ratings of Group Atmosphere, Esteem for the Leader and Effectiveness of the Leader. Assuming that these ratings are somewhat similar to the "satisfaction" or "liking" indexes and efficiency ratings employed in the previous studies, these highly significant correlations present a replication of the general finding that the leader's considerate behavior is most critically related to his subordinates' morale and to his subordinates' evaluation of leadership effectiveness. It is interesting to note, however, that on the highly unstructured TAT task, the

Table 1

Correlations of the Members' (Indian plus American) Ratings of the Leader's Behavior and the Various Attitude and Performance Scores (N = 36)

	Task I Caste Problem		Task II TAT Stories	
	Cons.	Struc.	Cons.	Struc.
Members' rating of:				
1. Group Atmosphere	.62**	-.07	.60**	-.05
2. Esteem for leader	.47**	.10	.58**	.03
3. Effectiveness of leader	.53**	.31	.46**	.41*
Actual group performance score	.06	.36*	-.10	.39*

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

leader's Initiation of Structure behavior was significantly correlated with his effectiveness rating ($r = .41$, $p < .05$). This result, however, was most evident when the two members' ratings were combined. Quite different results were obtained when separate analyses were made for the two cultural groups.

When the group's performance scores were correlated with the combined members' ratings of the leader's behavior on both tasks, only the Initiation of Structure scores were significantly related to group effectiveness. Specifically, group performance was positively related to the amount of structuring behavior the members attributed to the leader. Again, however, the result is derived from a sum of the Indian and American members' ratings.

The overall results of Table 1 suggest that the leader's considerate behavior had its most salient effect upon the members' acceptance of the leader and favorable evaluations of the group itself. However, objective group performance was related only to the leader's structuring behavior. It follows that in these discussion groups, the members' satisfaction or morale was not related to task performance. Verification of this notion was obtained from the fact that the group performance scores on both tasks were not correlated with the Group Atmosphere scores or the Esteem or Effectiveness ratings of the leader on either of the two tasks.

American Member's Ratings of Leader Behavior

Separate correlational analyses were conducted on the American member's ratings and the ratings made by the Indian member. The results for the American subjects are shown in Table 2 which indicates that ratings of the leader's considerate behavior were highly correlated with the Effectiveness and Esteem ratings and also with the Group Atmosphere score on both of the discussion tasks. It is interesting to note, however, that the Initiation of Structure scores as well as the Consideration scores were correlated with

Table 2

Correlations of the American Member's Ratings of the Leader's Behavior and the Various Attitude and Performance Scores (N = 36)

	Task I		Task II	
	Caste Problem		TAT Stories	
	Cons.	Struc.	Cons.	Struc.
American member's rating of:				
1. Group Atmosphere	.54**	.09	.62**	.07
2. Esteem for leader	.51**	.26	.58**	.13
3. Effectiveness of leader	.58**	.42*	.39*	.42*
Actual group performance score	-.05	.38*	-.17	.18

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

the Effectiveness ratings on the two tasks. For the American members the effective leader was one who was high on both dimensions of Consideration and Initiation of Structure. Despite the rather extreme differences in the amount of structure imposed upon the group by the nature of the two tasks, the American subjects apparently felt that effective leadership required the instigation of structure as well as acts of consideration among the group members.

Correlations with the actual group performance scores showed that ratings of Consideration were unrelated to performance on both tasks. Ratings of Initiation of Structure were significantly correlated with group performance on the Caste problem but were unrelated to performance on the TAT task.

Indian Member's Ratings of Leader Behavior

Table 3 presents the correlations computed on the ratings obtained from the Indian subjects. Again it is apparent that the leader's considerate behavior was highly related to the Esteem and Effectiveness ratings and to the Group Atmosphere scores. In contrast to the American subjects, however, the Indian subjects did not feel that structuring behavior initiated by the leader was conducive to effectiveness as a group leader. The Effectiveness ratings were not correlated with the Initiation of Structure scores on either task. This finding may identify an important difference in leader role expectations between the two cultural groups. That is, the American subjects rated the leader as being effective to the extent that he displayed both considerate and structuring behavior during the group's problem solving activities. The Indian subjects, on the other hand, rated the leader as being effective based only on his considerate behavior. The effective leader was not seen as instigating structure on either of the two tasks.

Table 3

Correlations of the Indian Member's Ratings of the Leader's Behavior and the Various Attitude and Performance Scores (N = 36)

	Task I		Task II	
	Caste Problem		TAT Stories	
	Cons.	Struc.	Cons.	Struc.
Indian Member's rating of:				
1. Group Atmosphere	.64**	.05	.62**	.02
2. Esteem for leader	.38*	.30	.52**	.06
3. Effectiveness of leader	.34*	.21	.37*	.27
Actual group performance score	.05	.12	.02	.42*

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Also evident in Table 3 is the fact that the Indian ratings were not correlated with group performance on the first task, but the Initiation of Structure ratings were significantly related to group performance on the second, creativity,task. This result is again somewhat opposite to the pattern of correlations obtained from the American subjects which showed a significant relationship between group performance and ratings of structure on the first task.

Leader' Self Ratings

Apart from a study by Oaklander and Fleishman (1964) few studies have obtained the leader's ratings of his own considerate and structuring behavior. Since all 36 of the leaders in the present experiment described their own behavior on the Leader Behavior Questionnaire, correlations could be computed between these self ratings and the leader's Group Atmosphere score, as well as the leader's ratings of his own effectiveness. Self-esteem ratings were not available for the leaders.

As can be seen in Table 4 the correlations of the leader's self ratings present a pattern somewhat different from that obtained from the ratings made by the group members. The leader's Group Atmosphere score and his rating of Consideration and Initiation of Structure on both of the tasks. In other words, the leader felt he was most effective when he was able to structure the task activities of the group and at the same time was able to display considerate behavior toward the group members. Similarly, the leader perceived that the morale or atmosphere of the group was more enjoyable or favorable when he was able to perform both leadership functions.

The correlations with the actual group performance scores showed that Consideration was unrelated to group performance on both tasks, while the Initiation of Structure ratings were correlated with group performance only on the first task. This latter finding coincides with the results presented

Table 4

Correlations of the Leader's Ratings of His Own Behavior and the Various Attitude and Performance Scores

(N = 36)

	Task I		Task II	
	Caste Problem		TAT Stories	
	Cons.	Struc.	Cons.	Struc.
Leader's Rating of:				
1. Group Atmosphere	.33*	.52**	.56**	.58**
2. Effectiveness (of self)	.33*	.55**	.56**	.56**
Actual group performance score	.15	.37*	.03	.15

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

in Table 2 which also indicated that group performance was correlated with the American's ratings of the leader's structuring behavior but only on the first task. On the other hand, it will be recalled from Table 3 that the Indian's rating of the leader's structuring behavior was correlated with group performance only on the second task. Apparently the American subjects were describing somewhat different aspects of the leader's structuring behavior than were the Indian subjects. It may be, however, that the leader was, in fact, instigating different degrees of structuring toward the two group members. The correlation between the American and Indian ratings of the leader's behavior on this factor was -.08 on the Caste problem and .24 on the TAT task.

Some clarification may accrue by noting differences between the two tasks themselves. Data collected in the original study rather obviously suggested that the Caste problem was biased in favor of the Indian member. The American member, being somewhat less familiar with the Indian culture and caste system tended to withdraw from participation on the problem. Since an adequate solution to the Caste problem had to be acceptable to both the Indian and American cultures, group performance was bolstered to the extent that the leader was able to "structure" the American member's participation into the group discussion. On this task then the American's ratings of the leader's Initiation of Structure were positively correlated with group performance. Quite the opposite situation probably occurred on the TAT problem if it is assumed that this task was somewhat biased in favor of the American subjects. Compared to the Indian subjects, the American subjects probably were more familiar with psychological testing and this type of "off-beat" creativity task (Anderson, 1964). On this second task the leader's structuring activities may have focused mainly upon the Indian member in an attempt to include him in the group's discussion. Thus, the Indian member's perception of the leader's structuring behavior was correlated with group performance more strongly on this second task.

Discussion

The data support the findings of several previous studies which examined the leader behaviors identified as Consideration and Initiation of Structure. Both the Indian and American members' esteem for their leader and their evaluation of the discussion group were positively related to ratings of the leader's considerate behavior. However, objective measures of group task performance were related only to the Initiation of Structure factor. In addition, these esteem or "satisfaction" indexes of the members were quite independent of the group's task performance. Thus one more instance is provided where group "satisfaction" or "morale" is not predictive of the group's success at its task assignment (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Katzell, et al., 1961). Group morale apparently was more highly related to considerate leader behavior while task performance was correlated with the leader's structuring behavior.

The data also suggest that the structure and consideration dimensions of leader behavior can profitably be extended to the intercultural group. In doing so, however, a rather serious caveat should be noted, implying that ratings obtained from each of the cultural groups must be examined separately in relation to such variables as group performance and effectiveness ratings. The hasty conclusions which could be drawn from the combined ratings in Table 1 exemplify such problems. When examined separately, however, the American subject's effectiveness ratings of the leader were positively related to both factors of Consideration and Initiation of Structure while the Indian ratings of leader effectiveness were correlated only with the Consideration factor. The results for the American subjects are consistent with studies such as Halpin (1957) which also indicated that leaders high on both Consideration and Initiation of Structure were rated as being more effective than leaders low on both dimensions. The ratings of the Indian subjects, however, indicated

that leaders who were high only on the Consideration factor were felt to be effective. The leader's structuring behavior was not related to his effectiveness as perceived by the Indian members.

These results, as well as those of other leadership studies, can, to some extent, be clarified by evoking the rather common notion of "role expectations" (Sarbin, 1954; McGrath, 1964). If we assume that groups (i.e., cultures) generate a set of normative role expectations regarding appropriate leader behavior, evaluations of the leader's effectiveness may then, in part, be determined by the degree to which the leader's actual behavior corresponds to these leader role expectations regardless of the objective success of the group. The effectiveness ratings made by the American subjects (both leader and member) suggest that the role expectations extant among the American cultural group anticipate that effective leadership behavior will include both considerate and structuring activities. On the other hand, the effectiveness ratings made by the Indian subjects, being related only to the Consideration factor, suggest that Initiation of Structure is a less salient aspect of the leader role expectations in the Indian culture. The Indian's lack of emphasis on the leader's structuring behavior may be due to an Indian cultural norm which minimizes the importance and effectiveness of the manipulative, autocratic behavior implied by the Initiation of Structure factor. However, the anthropological evidence suggests this is not the case; and that, in fact, authoritarian, autocratic leader behavior more closely approximates the prevalent leadership expectations in the Indian culture (Hsu, 1961). On the other hand, it should be noted that the Indian subjects were rating the effectiveness of an American leader, not an Indian leader. They may, therefore, have felt that appropriate leader behavior should be more "democratic" and considerate. Thus they tended to overemphasize the consideration factor.

Regardless of the validity of the explanation, the data are quite emphatic in emphasizing that when ratings are obtained from members of intercultural groups, separate analyses should be made for each of the cultures represented. This is especially true if the cultures are likely to generate diverse expectations regarding what constitutes appropriate leader behavior.

It should also be mentioned en passant that the so-called role expectations regarding effective leader behavior in the present data are ratings made by the leader's subordinates or by the leader himself. As mentioned earlier, the role expectations which are generated by a leader's superiors do not necessarily correspond to subordinates' ratings. When evaluated by his superiors, the leader's structuring behavior generally is found to be more important in determining effectiveness ratings (Halpin, 1954; Fleishman, et al., 1955). Of further interest is the fact that neither subordinate nor superior ratings are necessarily highly related to objective measures of the productivity of the leader's group. For example, in the study by Fleishman, et al., (1955) it was found that the ideal leadership pattern for foremen as described by the foreman's superiors was, in fact, positively correlated with such indices as grievances, turnover, absences, and accidents in the foreman's department. Although superior's ratings were not obtained in the present study, members' ratings of the leader's effectiveness were unrelated to group performance on both tasks. Rather than evaluating the leader on the basis of the group's task performance, the members apparently felt the leader was effective to the extent that he conformed to their own role expectations regarding appropriate leader behavior.

A word of caution should be noted regarding inferences of causality in the present data. It was assumed that leader behavior was a determinant of member satisfaction, esteem, etc., and hence, the ratings of Consideration and Initiation of Structure were seen as antecedent to other ratings obtained

from the members. Quite obviously, however, the opposite interpretation is tenable. That is, rather than considerate leader behavior inducing a pleasant group atmosphere, it may be that a pleasant group atmosphere caused the members to rate their leader as being highly considerate. It is also plausible that both the Group Atmosphere score and the Consideration ratings were being determined by a common third factor which was not identified adequately in the study. Because of the many studies which have identified Consideration and Initiation of Structure as dimensions of leader behavior which are antecedent to member satisfaction, the data may be interpreted (cautiously) as supporting the general notion that leader behaviors are a determinant of members' evaluations and effectiveness ratings.

Summary

Ratings of leader's Initiation of Structure and Consideration, as well as ratings of Group Atmosphere, Esteem for Leader, and Effectiveness of Leader, were obtained from 36 intercultural (American and Indian students) discussion groups. Each group completed an intercultural negotiation task and a group creativity task. On both tasks American and Indian members' Esteem for Leader and Group Atmosphere ratings were positively correlated with the leader's considerate behavior but were not related to the leader's structuring behavior. The leader's Effectiveness as rated by Americans was positively correlated with both Consideration and Initiation of Structure scores. When rated by the Indian subjects, the leader's Effectiveness was correlated only with his Consideration score. Correlations with group performance scores were specific to the culture and the task.

References

Anderson, L.R. Some effects of leadership training on intercultural discussion groups. Technical Report No. 18, 1964. Urbana, Ill.: Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory, University of Illinois.

Anderson, L.R. and Fiedler, F.E. The effect of participatory and supervisory leadership on group creativity. J. Appl. Psychol., 1964, 48, 227-236.

Anderson, L.R. and Fishbein, M. Prediction of attitude from the number, strength, and evaluative aspects of beliefs about the attitude object: A comparison of summation and congruity theories. J. Person. Soc. Psychol., 1965, 2, 437-443.

Bass, A.R. Some determinants of supervisory and peer ratings. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1963.

Bass, B.M. Leadership, psychology and organizational behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Berkowitz, L.W. Sharing leadership in small, decision-making groups. J. abn. soc. Psychol., 1953, 48, 231-238.

Brayfield, A.H. and Crockett, W.H. Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychol. Bull., 1955, 52, 396-424.

Clark, R.A. Analyzing the group structure of combat rifle squads. Amer. Psychol., 1953, 8, 333 (Abstract).

Fiedler, F.E. Leader attitudes and group creativity. J. abn. soc. Psychol., 1962, 65, 308-318.

Fishbein, M. and Raven, B.H. The AB scales: An operational definition of belief and attitude. Hum. Relat., 1962, 15, 35-44.

Fleishman, E.A. The measurement of leadership attitudes in industry. J. appl. Psychol., 1953, 37, 153-158.

Fleishman, E.A. Leadership climate, human relations training and supervisory behavior. Personnel Psychol., 1955, 6, 205-222.

Fleishman, E.A. and Harris, E.F. Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. Personnel Psychol., 1962, 15, 43-56.

Fleishman, E.A., Harris, E.F. and Burtt, H.E. Leadership and supervision in industry. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, 1955.

Fleishman, E.A. and Peters, D.R. Interpersonal values, leadership attitudes, and managerial "success". Personnel Psychol., 1962, 15, 127-143.

Foa, U.G. Relation of workers expectation to satisfaction with supervisor. Personnel Psychol., 1957, 10, 161-168.

Halpin, A.W. The leadership behavior and combat performance of airplane commanders. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1954, 49, 19-22.

Halpin, A.W. The leader behavior and effectiveness of aircraft commanders. In, R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1957.

Halpin, A.W. and Winer, B.J. The leadership behavior of the airplane commander. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1952.

Hemphill, J.K. Situational factors in leadership. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Personnel Research Board, 1949.

Hsu, F.L.K. Psychological anthropology. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1961.

Kahn, R.L. and Katz, D. Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale. In, D. Cartwright and A.L. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1960.

Katzell, R.A., Barrett, R.S. and Parker, T.C. Job satisfaction, job performance, and situational characteristics. J. appl. Psychol., 1961, 45, 65-72.

Lawrie, J.W. Evaluation of role occupants as a function of role expectation reciprocity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1963.

McGrath, J.E. Social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Meuwese, W.A.T. The effect of the leader's ability and interpersonal perception on group creativity under varying conditions of stress. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam, 1964.

Newport, G. A study of attitudes and leader behavior. Personnel Admin., 1962, 25, 42-46.

Oaklander, H. and Fleishman, E.A. Patterns of leadership related to organizational stress in hospital settings. Admin. Science Quart., 1964, 8, 520-532.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J. and Tannenbaum, P.H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Roach, D.E. Dimensions of leader behavior in the first-line supervisor. Amer. Psychol., 1956, 11, 379. (Abstract)

Rupe, J.C. When workers rate the boss. Personnel Psychol., 1951, 4, 271-290.

Sarbin, T.R. Role theory. In, G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Shartle, C.L. Executive performance and leadership. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Stogdill, R.M., Scott, E.L. and Jaynes, W.E. A factorial study of very short scales. In, R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1957.

Tucker, L.R. A method for the synthesis of factor analysis studies. Personnel Research Section Report No. 984. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1951.

Wherry, R.J. Factor analysis of officer qualification. Form QCL-2B. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1950.

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1 ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)

Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

2a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

Unclassified

2b GROUP

3 REPORT TITLE

INITIATION OF STRUCTURE, CONSIDERATION, AND TASK PERFORMANCE IN INTERCULTURAL DISCUSSION GROUPS

4 DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)

Technical Report, April 1966

5 AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)

Anderson, Lynn R.

6 REPORT DATE	7a TOTAL NO OF PAGES	7b NO. OF REFS
April, 1966	24	36

8a CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.

Nonr 1834 (36)

b PROJECT NO.

2870

c NR 177-472

d ARPA Order #454

9a ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

Technical Report No. 30

9b OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)

10 AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES

11 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

12 SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY

Department of Navy
Office of Naval Research
Group Psychology Branch

13 ABSTRACT

Ratings of the leader's Initiation of Structure and Consideration were obtained from members of 36 intercultural discussion groups consisting of one American and one Indian graduate student plus an American leader. Ratings of Group Atmosphere, Esteem for Leader, and Effectiveness of Leader were also obtained after each group had completed an intercultural negotiation task and also after completing a group creativity task. Results showed that on both tasks the American and Indian members' Esteem for Leader and Group Atmosphere ratings were positively correlated with the leader's considerate behavior but were not related to the leader's structuring behavior. The leader's Effectiveness as rated by Americans was positively correlated with both Consideration and Initiation of Structure scores. When rated by the Indian subjects, the leader's Effectiveness was correlated only with his Consideration score. The leader's self ratings of Consideration and Initiation of Structure both were positively correlated with his own rating of the Group Atmosphere and with his rating of his own Effectiveness. The group performance scores were unrelated to Consideration ratings. However, group performance was positively related to the Initiation of Structure ratings, but this finding was specific to the culture and the task. The results were discussed in terms of differences in "role expectations" between the two cultural groups.

DD FORM 1 JAN 64 1473

Security Classification

Security Classification

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Initiation of structure Consideration Task performance Intercultural discussion groups						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization *(corporate author)* issuing the report.

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT DATE: Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S): Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been assigned any other report numbers *(either by the originator or by the sponsor)*, also enter this number(s).

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES: Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

(1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."

(2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."

(3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through

_____."

(4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through

_____."

(5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through

_____."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring *(paying for)* the research and development. Include address.

13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as *(TS)*, *(S)*, *(C)*, or *(U)*.

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.

DD FORM 1 JAN 64 1473 (BACK)

Security Classification

THE LIBRARY OF
JAN 17 1983
CONTROLLER OF AVIATION